

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu (U.S. 2002/00220859 A1) (hereinafter "Muramatsu") in view Higashi et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,918,113) (hereinafter "Higashi") and further in view of Saito (JP 2003-124259) (hereinafter "Saito").

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended independent claim 1, and added new dependent claims 4-7, to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Claims 2-3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4-7 remain currently pending and under consideration.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view Higashi and further in view of Saito. Applicants have amended independent claim 1, and new dependent claims 4-7 have been added, to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Claims 2-3 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection of these claims moot. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 of the instant application has been newly-amended to describe an advantageous combination of features of a semiconductor device which includes recitations that

the first and second electrodes surround a space between the wiring substrate and the thinned portion of the semiconductor. Newly-amended independent claim 1 also goes on to now recite that the resin sheet surrounds said space and that the communicating portion penetrating the resin sheet is configured to allow air communication in it.

Applicants refer to technical remarks in previously-filed responses to date in this application which explain associated distinctions between the invention disclosed in the instant application and the applied references of record.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Muramatsu, Higashi, and Saito, whether taken separately or combined, do not teach or suggest each feature of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application. As pointed out by MPEP § 2143.03, “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.’ In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).”

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the newly-presented dependent claims 4-7 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, and the reasons discussed previously.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response; the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**



By:

Paul A. Fournier  
Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: October 9, 2009

**Customer No. 055694**  
**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
Tel.: (202) 842-8800  
Fax: (202) 842-8465